

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed October 23, 2006 (“Office Action”). Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-19 are pending in the application. Claims 9-19 have been withdrawn from consideration. The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, and 8. Applicants have amended Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, and 8. Applicants have added Claims 20-23. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 103 Rejections

The Office Action rejects Claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 1,906,422 to Roulton (“*Roulton*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,950,717 to Fay (“*Fay*”). The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of U.S. Patent No. 4,129,180 to Larinoff (“*Larinoff I*”), *Fay*, and *Roulton*. The Office Action rejects Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of *Larinoff*, *Fay*, and *Roulton*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,301,861 to Larinoff (“*Larinoff II*”), or U.S. Patent No. 5,067,560 to Carey et al. (“*Carey*”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent Claim 1, as amended, is allowable at least because the combination of *Larinoff*, *Roulton*, and *Fay* fails to disclose, expressly or inherently, “a plurality of valves which each have an inlet and an outlet, said inlets of said valves are offset from each other so that at least one of said inlets is vertically lower than at least one other inlet of said inlets throughout all angles of a roll of the aircraft.” The Office Action relies on *Roulton* as disclosing a previous version of this limitation; however, *Roulton* fails to disclose, expressly or inherently, “a plurality of valves which each have an inlet and an outlet, said inlets of said valves are offset from each other so that at least one of said inlets is vertically lower than at least one other inlet of said inlets throughout all angles of a roll of the aircraft.” For instance, *Roulton* clearly discloses that the inlet to each valve is at the exact same height as every other inlet. *See Roulton*, Fig 1. Furthermore, *Roulton* clearly fails to disclose an aircraft. For at least this reason, Independent Claim 1, as amended, is allowable, as are Claims 2, 4, 6-8, and 20-23 that depend therefrom. Reconsideration and favorable action is requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact Bradley P. Williams, Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6447.

Applicants believe no other fees are due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTT S L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants

Bradley P. Williams
Reg. No. 40,227

Date: December 22, 2006

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
(214) 953-6447

at Customer No.

05073